arXiv:1511.03509v1 [quant-ph] 11 Nov 2015

Signaling loophole in experimental Bell tests

Adam Bednorz[1,*]

[1]*Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, ul. Pasteura 5, PL02-093 Warsaw, Poland*

The recent Bell test performed in Delft [B. Hensen *et al.* Nature 526, 682 (2015), arXiv:1508.05949], claimed as loophole-free, has shown violation of local realism with 96% confidence level. However, the raw data indicate violation of no-signaling principle (microcausality) around 99% confidence level. While violation of local realism is consistent with quantum mechanics, it is not the case of no-signaling. Violation of the latter would be a groundbreaking revolution in physics but also invalidate the conclusion of the Bell theorem, where it no-signaling assumed and must be verified or at least not falsified. If the signature of signaling is believed to be a statistical error, a fair calculation of the Bell parameter gives $S = 1.86 < 2$, in accordance with local realism. Therefore further experimental tests are urgent to clarify with better confidence level whether local realism or no-signaling is violated or none of them.

No-signaling or microscopic causality means that no information can be transmitted faster that light. An observation cannot be affected by a disturbance located at a point in spacetime such that the distance by the time difference is greater than speed of light (spacelike). It is one of the rules of special relativity adopted in quantum mechanics. Of course no-signaling is valid not only in quantum mechanics but any theory consistent with special relativity, although usually no-signaling is rather postulated [1] than proved or derived. In quantum theory it means that spacelike separated freely chosen disturbance and measurement cannot affect each other, they are compatible (commuting).

No-signaling is also the basic assumption of the Bell theorem that quantum mechanics violates local realism [2]. Two observers are separated and make their measurements mutually spacelike or at least compatible. In the test it is essential that the observers make a choice what to measure and complete the readout spacelike. Only then the violation of a Bell-type inequality [3] refutes local realism because, comparing to local real models, one assumes that the readout of one observers does not depend on the other one.

While quantum mechanics predicts preserving no-signaling while violation of local realism, both properties are subject to experimental tests. Both cannot ever be fully confirmed but can be falsified. No-signaling can be simply tested by checking if a (randomly chosen) disturbance can change a spacelike readout. In fast such a test is a byproduct of every loophole-free Bell test (i.e. with free or random choices, spacelike separated from mutual readouts). It also applies to the Delft experiment [4], where the published data [5] can be also used to check no-signaling. Previous Bell tests with random choice [6] had too low efficiency to violate either no-signaling or local realism without loopholes.

Here we show that the Delft data suggest violation of no-signaling with 93% confidence level, which is not far from violation of local realism (96%) and can be increased to 98.9% by taking full time window for heralding clicks. If violation of no-signaling is assumed to be a statistical error the Bell parameter should be calculated as 1.86 which is below 2, where local realism holds. No-signaling, the basic assumption of the Bell test may be not satisfied and this result is inconsistent with present quantum mechanics, opening a loophole. We will discuss further experiments to be performed and analyzed and possible changes in quantum theory if no-signaling is indeed violated.



FIG. 1: Microcausality in the case of two choices a and b and three measurements A (blue), B (red) and C (white) lying spacelike with respect to b, a and both, respectively. According to the principle the outcome of A cannot depend on b, B on b and C on both. A measurement in green region can depend on both a and b.

Let us start recalling predictions of quantum mechanics based on no-signaling. Randomly chosen influences (e.g. qubit rotations) a_x ($= 0, 1$ in a dichotomic choice) and measurements of A_x are located in spacetime points $x = (x^0 = ct, \vec{x})$, with time t, speed of light c and spatial position $\vec{x}$. According to no-signaling principle, the probability $p(A_x|a_y)$ of the measurement of A at x while the choice a at y has been made cannot depend on a if $x - y = z$ is spacelike, namely $|z^0| < |\vec{z}|$, which visually means being outside of the causality cone, $|z^0| \geq |\vec{z}|$ and $z_0 > 0$. More generally $P(A_x, B_y, C_z, ...|a_u, b_v, ...)$ will not depend on a if $x - u$, $y - u$, $z - u$ are spacelike, and similarly with b. In the recent experiment we have the situation depicted in Fig. 1; for brevity we drop subscripts. Here $C = 1$ upon successful entanglement herading and 0 otherwise. The choices a and b are independent and dichotomic, assigned 0 or 1. The measured values of qubit states, A and B are $+1$ or -1. The value of C cannot

*Electronic address: Adam.Bednorz@fuw.edu.pl

N_{ab}	0	1	a
0	53	62	
1	79	51	
b			

TABLE I: Heralding events $N_{ab} = p(C = 1|a, b)N$ for all combinations of a and b times the number of attempts N in the heralding window.

N_{ab}	0	1	a
0	175	195	
1	218	159	
b			

TABLE II: Heralding events $N_{ab} = p(C = 1|a, b)N$ for all combinations of a and b times the number of attempts N, without heralding window constraints.

depend on either a or b and so the probability $p(C = 1)$ should be the same for all values of a and b. Taking the data from [4] Fig. 4a one can find this probability times the total number of attempts for every combination of a and b, see Table I.

It is clear that $Np(C = 1|a = 0, b = 1) = N_{01} = 79$ is much different from $Np(C = 1|a = 1, b = 1) = N_{11} = 51$. These probabilities shoud be equal if the random number generators work properly. Of course the differences can be due to statistical error. Summing 01 an 11 events we obtain 130 which gives P-value 0.0175, probability of the null hypothesis of no-signaling. However, we could take any column or row (for a or b fixed) so in fact it is 4 times larger, 0.07 giving 93% confidence level for violation for no-signaling principle. Moreover, the independence of a and b is violated. Namely, if 0 is chosen with a probability p_a and 1 with q_a, $p_a + q_a = 1$ and similarly for b then still independence requires that

$$N_{00}N_{11} = Np_ap_bq_aq_b = N_{01}N_{10} = Np_aq_bq_ap_b \qquad (1)$$

while $53 \cdot 51$ differs much from $79 \cdot 62$. Moreover, taking full data [5] and relax the heralding window time constraints to get result in Table II. Then $79 \to 218$ and $51 \to 159$ (the distribution is roughly the same), giving the P-value 0.00276, or, with the factor 4, 0.011 so the confidence level is around 98.9%, higher than Bell violation.

Similar analysis can be made for $p(A, C = 1)$ and $p(B, C = 1)$. Then $\alpha = (p(A = 1, C = 1) - p(A = -1, C = 1))N$ cannot depend on b while $\beta = (p(B = 1, C = 1) - p(B = -1, C = 1))N$ cannot depend on a. Again, taking the data from the Delft experiment [4] we get the results in Table IV. The number at two sides of a single line should coincide while a double line can separate different values. Relaxing heralding window [5], we get Table III. Here the differences are non-zero but the P-value is larger than for $p(C = 1)$. One could in principle test signaling similarly in purely photonic Bell tests,

α	0	1	a
0	-1	2	
1	9	-3	
b			

β	0	1	a
0	1	-6	
1	-3	-1	
b			

TABLE III: α and β for all combinations of a and b times the number of attempts N in the heralding window. No-signaling requires that the values separated by a single line should be equal. Values separated by a double line can be different.

α	0	1	a
0	5	-23	
1	-2	-19	
b			

β	0	1	a
0	-23	-7	
1	-28	-3	
b			

TABLE IV: α and β for all combinations of a and b times the number of attempts N without heralding window constraints. No-signaling requires that the values separated by a single line should be equal. Values separated by a double line can be different.

but efficiency in so far performed experiments was too low [6].

Local realism imposes Bell-Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality [3]

$$S = \sum_{ab}(-1)^{ab}\langle AB\rangle_{C=1,ab} \leq 2 \qquad (2)$$

where and $\langle\cdot\rangle_{C=1,ab}$ denotes average conditional on the occurrence $C = 1$ and choices ab. In practice we express it by numbers of events N,

$$\langle AB\rangle_{C=1} = \frac{N(AB = 1, C = 1) - N(AB = -1, C = 1)}{N(C = 1)} \qquad (3)$$

and in this way in [4] $S = 2.42$ appeared. However, no-signaling also predicts that $N(C = 1)$ should not depend on ab. Therefore, claiming that differences are only statistical errors, it is fair to replace every $N(C = 1)$ by the *largest* $N(C = 1) = 79$. In this way we assume that missing coincidences are uncorrelated. Then we get $S = 147/79 \simeq 1.86 < 2$ and the inequality is satisfied; local realism holds. If we take average of the two largest N, we get $S = 147/70.5 = 2.08$ which exceeds 2 below one standard deviation. This is why the present data are insufficient to determine which of the two principles, no-signaling or local realism, is actually violated, or maybe everything is just a statistical error.

The signaling may be only apparently superluminal because there could be effects changing the factual time of the choice or readout (e.g. synchronization error). Both choices and readouts are machine-made not yet human-concluded [8]. Nevertheless, here we trust technical details and focus of the option of superluminal signaling. It is important that no-signaling principle does not follow from any deeper basic law. Rather it is one of Wightman axioms in the construction of relativistic quantum

field theory [1]. Interestingly, some of Wightman axioms can be proved, e.g. relativistic invariance of the vacuum [7]. It partially supports no-signaling because of spacelike choice and measurement we can change a reference frame to such where both have equal times and commute. However, the proof is formally perturbative and the question is if perturbative no-signaling is convincing. The answer is no and it is instructive to look at a counterexample, depicted in Fig. 2. Let us take a real scalar field Φ with the action density

$$c^2(\partial_0\Phi)^2/2 - c_1^2(\nabla\Phi)^2/2 - m^2c^4\Phi^2/2\hbar^2 \tag{4}$$

Standard canonical quantization rules mean introducing momentum $\Pi = \partial_t\Phi$, impose equal-time commutator $[\Phi(\vec{x}),\Pi(\vec{y})] = i\hbar\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$ and construct Hamiltonian density

$$\Pi^2/2 + c_1^2(\nabla\Phi)^2/2 + m^2c^4\Phi^2/2\hbar^2 \tag{5}$$

which gives Heisenberg fields $\Phi(x)$.

It is clear that the signaling speed is c_1 and the commutator (causal Green function) $G(x-y) = [\Phi(x),\Phi(y)]/i\hbar$ can be written [9]

$$G(x) = \mathrm{Re}\int \frac{2d^4k}{c(2\pi)^4}\frac{e^{ik_0x^0-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}}}{(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - c_1^2|\vec{k}|^2/c^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2} \tag{6}$$

where $\epsilon \to 0_+$ and can be calculated exactly to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{mc^2\theta(c_1|x^0|/c-|\vec{x}|)}{4\pi\hbar c_1^2}\times \\ &\frac{J_1(mc^2\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2}/\hbar c_1)}{\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2}} \\ &-\delta(c_1^2|x_0|^2/c^2-|\vec{x}|^2)\frac{\mathrm{sgn}x^0}{2\pi c_1}\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with the Bessel function J. In noninteracting theory the commutator is the same as classical Poisson bracket. In practical quantum field theory we need to subtract renormalizing commutator with a large mass $M^2 \gg m^2$ which effectively gives

$$\begin{aligned}&G_{ren}(x) = \frac{c^2\theta(c_1|x^0|/c-|\vec{x}|)}{4\pi\hbar c_1^2}\times \\ &\frac{J_1(mc^2\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2}/\hbar c_1)}{\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2/m}} - m\to M\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The commutator is non-zero inside the causal cone given by $|\vec{x}| < c_1|x^0|/c$ defining the signaling speed as c_1. Now, let us solve the problem perturbatively, rewriting

$$c_1^2(\nabla\Phi)^2 = c^2(\nabla\Phi)^2 + c^2\alpha(\nabla\Phi)^2 \tag{9}$$

where $\alpha = c_1^2/c^2 - 1$ is a "small" perturbative parameter. Perturbative solution means changing c_1 at constant x



FIG. 2: Failure of perturbative microcausality. The exact calculation gives the signaling speed c_1, bounding blue area. Starting from a field with signaling speed c, bounding red area with perturbative expansion the signaling boundary remains unchanged (read area).

and simply reads

$$\begin{aligned}&G^{per}_{ren}(x) = \frac{c^2\theta(|x^0|-|\vec{x}|)}{4\pi\hbar c_1^2}\times \\ &\frac{J_1(mc^2\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2}/\hbar c_1)}{\sqrt{(c_1|x^0|/c)^2-|\vec{x}|^2}/m} - m\to M\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

while for negative α and $|x^0| > |\vec{x}| > c_1|x^0|/c$ we replace $J_1(is) = iI_1(s)$, which is an analytic continuation at $s=0$. The result is clearly different from exact solution and the reason is that signaling boundary cone limits the validity of perturbative expansion. The root of the problem lies in the Fourier representation

$$\begin{aligned}&[(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - c_1^2k^2/c^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2]^{-1} = \\ &[(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - k^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2 - \alpha k^2]^{-1} = \\ &[(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - k^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2]^{-1} + \\ &\alpha k^2[(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - k^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2]^{-2} + \\ &\alpha^2k^4[(k_0+i\epsilon)^2 - k^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2]^{-3} + \ldots\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for $k = |\vec{k}|$. Due to the pole, the expansion in the geometric series is convergent only for $\alpha k^2 < k_0^2 - m^2c^2/\hbar^2$, although it leads to a finite contribution at each order of α. Summation beyond convergence region is only formal and rather interpreted as analytic continuation. Hence, this step is obviously nonperturbative. One could in principle include analytic continuation of such Dyson series in one of the rules of quantum mechanics but it is impossible to check all dangerous examples in interacting theories, e.g. bound states and higher order correlation functions.

Quantum field theory may also break relativistic invariance either manifestly or spontaneously, e.g. to properly take into account gravity [10]. Moreover, any quantum realism based consistent with quantum field theory requires at least spontaneous choice of a reference frame, so relativistic invariance may need to be abandoned at some point [11]. If relativity, at least special, somewhere

breaks down, then no-signaling may be still valid but e.g. at higher speed limit. All such theoretical possibilities can be confirmed or ruled out only experimentally and Bell test can help to check relativistic microcausality as one of presently assumed property of quantum field theory. Experimental tests, perhaps improving the recent one, are urgent to verify which principle, local realism or relativistic no-signaling, is actually violated, if at all. It is important to introduce in future experimental Bell tests a standard test of no-signaling at the same time. It may happen that no-signaling is violated much weaker than Bell-type inequality, therefore if experimenters want to confirm no-signaling and violate local realism at the same time, the confidence levels should be different by orders of magnitude, and all the raw data must me inspected. I believe that the situation will be soon clarified.

In conclusion, Bell-type tests give an opportunity to check no-signaling principle at the same time. Current data are insufficient to distinguish whether no-signaling or local realism holds. Further or improved experiments are necessary to verify or falsify both principles, while a theory alone cannot prove or disprove any of them from more basic physical laws, without nonperturbative axioms.

I acknowledge W. Belzig, R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański and P. Chankowski for helpful discussions and suggestions.

Note added: In the most recent tests the full data to test no-signaling have not yet been published [12, 13] although in [12] the signature of signaling based of the reported data seems to be smaller than violation of local realism. Moreover, in both experiments both random choices and readouts are machine-made so fair time tagging and choice is a matter of trust in electronics, not humans.

[1] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman, *PCT, spin and statistics, and all that* (Benjamin, New York, 1964)

[2] J.S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).

[3] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, R.A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).

[4] B. Hensen *et al.*, *Nature* **526**, 682 (2015)

[5] dx.doi.org/10.4121/uuid:6e19e9b2-4a2d-40b5-8dd3-a660bf3c0a31

[6] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5039 (1998); T. Scheidl *et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**, 19708 (2010).

[7] A. Bednorz, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2654 (2013)

[8] H. Wiseman, *Nature* **510**, 467 (2014).

[9] P. Peskin and D. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Perseus Books, Reading, 1995)

[10] A. Kostelecky, N. Russell, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 11 (2011)

[11] A. Bednorz, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 093006 (2015)

[12] L.K. Shalm *et al.*, arXiv:1511.03189

[13] M. Giustina *et al.* arXiv:1511.03190